

A3

21 February 1967

MEMORANDUM FOR:

ATTENTION:

THROUGH:

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Speed Letter
Dated 30 January 1967

1. Analysis of the UFO target on the provided micrographs was performed to the limited extent permitted by the copy prints. It must be remembered that the conclusions presented are based on the examination of copies rather than the originals. The copying process will not only the grain and noise characteristics of the original image, but also may distort the geometry of orientation even when the exact enlargement parameters are known. In this case, these parameters are unknown.

2. The following was assumed for the basis of this analysis. The accuracy of these assumptions, however, is questionable.

a. The total enlargement factor of prints one and three is the same.

b. The total enlargement factor of prints two and five is the same.

c. The total enlargement factor of prints one and three is approximately two times that of prints two and five.

3. Findings:

a. The pattern of apparent grain-clustering is similar in prints one and three and in prints two and five.

b. The edges of the UFO image are more sharply defined in prints one and three than in either of the helicopter images in print three.

T-13

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Special Letter
dated 30 January 1967

c. Contract and density analysis of the images was not considered valid due to the inherent distortions caused by the copying process.

d. The edge sharpness of the UDO image in print two appears quite similar to the edge sharpness of the pipe in the same print.

e. It is assumed that the difference in image size between prints two and five was caused by a change in camera-to-UDO distance. This difference was less in print five than in print two. The following two conditions are offered:

(1) Considering a large UDO at a distance of approximately a quarter mile (1,000 feet) and a stationary camera location, the UDO would have had to travel a considerably distance (300 feet) in a flight line almost directly toward the camera position to produce such a change in image size.

(2) Considering a small, stationary UDO at a distance of approximately six feet and a slightly variable (1/200 feet) in camera location, a change in image size of this magnitude would have resulted from a change in camera location of less than the above variable.

f. has reviewed the quantitative results obtained by and has found no discrepancies in what has been done. Unfortunately, with the material available very little objective indication can be obtained except building more tables of object size versus distances from the camera station. I feel that the proposed study would enable further quantitative study by providing the total geometric areas worked through of the enclosure. It is anticipated that this study would concentrate on three areas:

(1) Image size computation including sizes, distances, and angles.

SUBJECT: Answer to Request of Seal Letter
dated 30 January 1967

(2) Stereoscopic analysis of the UFO and its
relationship with the surrounding branches, pole,
and camera station.

(3) Dynamic analysis of the relative movement
of the system including camera station and UFO.

4. Conclusion:

No definite. To decide the authenticity of the
object as being a UFO is not possible from the furnished
prints. It is possible that an analysis of the original
photographs would provide additional information which would
enable a definite conclusion. Associated facts concern
the facilities reluctance to discuss or show the original
photographs, the circumstantial nature of the information
through which the photographs were taken and the difference
in scale of the UFO. Large between point two and five
which is most easily explained with a model to
contribute to the model theory. No definite conclusion
as to whether the object is either a model or a genuine
UFO can be arrived at this time.